

Attachment 2
Remediation Options Proposed by Board Staff

Option 1 – Conduct a Board Managed Cleanup with an Up-Front Guarantee of Cost Recovery at a Cost of \$25,000/year (no interest)

- Pros:
- o Cleanup would be done very soon and would remove all tires, thus eliminating the risk of a tire fire.
 - o Includes a cost-recovery component, and is therefore more likely to receive Board approval.
 - o No interest is charged to the county for the money advanced for cleanup.
 - o Repayment amount per year matches the amount identified by the county as available for this purpose.
 - o Because a board contractor will do the cleanup, the county will not have to find a contractor, manage the contractor, or oversee the cleanup.
- Cons:
- o All cleanup money would have to be repaid eventually.
 - o The county would need to come up with new funding for management of their ongoing tire collection program
 - o The county will not have direct control over the management of the cleanup, including such issues as ultimate end use of the tires and selection of the contractor and subcontractors.
 - o The actual amount to be repaid will only be known when the cleanup is completed.
 - o Because current Board policy requires that we pay a 30% incentive for sending tires to an end use vs landfill disposal, the final cleanup bill to the county could be 30% higher than a lower cost disposal option.

Option 2 – Board Administered Loan to be Repaid at \$25,000 per year (no interest)

- Pros:
- o Cleanup would be under the direct control of the county. The county is free to select the contractor and low cost option as desired.
 - o Includes a cost-recovery component, and is therefore more likely to receive Board approval.
 - o No interest is charged to the county for the loan.
 - o Repayment amount per year matches the amount identified by the county as available for this purpose.
- Cons:
- o All cleanup money would have to be repaid eventually.
 - o The county would need to come up with new funding for management of their ongoing tire collection program
 - o The county will have to select the contractors and oversee the cleanup.
 - o The actual amount of cleanup costs will not be known at the time that the loan is granted, so costs could exceed the amount of the loan.

Option 3 – Conduct a Board Managed Cleanup (No Cost Recovery or Loan Component)

- Pros:
- o Cleanup would be done very soon and would remove all tires, thus eliminating the risk of a tire fire.
 - o The county is not charged for the cost of cleanup.
 - o Because a board contractor will do the cleanup, the county will not have to find a contractor, manage the contractor, or oversee the cleanup.
- Cons:
- o Does not include a cost-recovery component, and is therefore less likely to receive Board approval.
 - o The county will not have direct control over the management of the cleanup, including such issues as ultimate end use of the tires and selection of the contractor and subcontractors.

Attachment 2 (cont.)

Option 4 – Waste Tire Cleanup Matching Grant

- Pros:
- o Cleanup would be under the direct control of the county. The county is free to select the contractor and low cost option as desired.
 - o The county is not required to repay the Board-provided grant funds.
 - o The county may be able to get approval for < 50% match and more than the \$50,000 limit.
 - o The county may be able to get Board concurrence for all or part of the match to be in something other than cash.
- Cons:
- o Does not include a cost-recovery component, so Board members may be less willing to approve
 - o The county will have to select the contractors and oversee the cleanup.
 - o The county may need to submit matching grant requests for several years, as the cost of cleanup is currently estimated at \$300,000. Depending on the other grant candidates competing in a given year, the county may not always receive the grant it requests.
 - o Because the cleanup will extend over several years, the potential for a tire fire will remain for as long as tires remain at the site.
 - o To receive a grant, current Board policy requires that a Waste Tire Enforcement Grant be in place for the geographic area covered by the Waste Tire Cleanup Matching Grant.

Option 5 – Board Grant for an Equipment Purchase (e.g., shredder/splitter to process waste tires)

- Pros:
- o Equipment would become a county asset.
 - o Equipment would be used to remediate existing tire pile.
 - o Equipment would be used after clean-up to manage daily flow of tires.
 - o Income for the disposal in post remediation years would be part of revenue stream to support existing solid waste system.
 - o Gate tender could run the small amount of tires delivered to the landfills once every couple of days, while Performing normal duties.
 - o No repayment
 - o Solution---long term
- Cons:
- o County Staff to do clean-up using splitter (could be inmate labor), will cost county.
 - o Landfilled shreds will take capacity out of site.
 - o County will incur costs for the maintenance of shredder/chipper.

Option 6 – Any Combination of the Above Options

This option is intended to provide maximum flexibility for the remediation of the waste tire pile at the Bishop Sunland Site.